UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,451	07/18/2006	Michael Bartsch	12810-00311-US1	7376
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP 1875 EYE STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			EXAMINER	
			KOSACK, JOSEPH R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/586,451	BARTSCH ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Joseph R. Kosack	1626				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 No.	ovember 2008					
· <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under Lx pane Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 455 C.G. 215.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.	1) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
	4					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/21/2006.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	te				

Application/Control Number: 10/586,451 Page 2

Art Unit: 1626

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-5 are pending in the instant application.

### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Example 1 in the reply filed on November 10, 2008 is acknowledged. Applicant's traversal has been found to be persuasive, and the requirement is withdrawn.

# **Priority**

The claim to priority as a 371 filing of PCT/EP05/00773 filed on January 27, 2005, which claims benefit of DE 102004004697.2 filed on January 29, 2004 is acknowledged in the instant application.

### Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 21, 2006 has been considered by the Examiner.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the steps for the actual hydrocyanation reaction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watson (GB-628686) in view of Arakawa et al. (USPN 4,504,692) and Fischer et al. (USPN 6,242,633).

Watson teaches the preparation of 1,3-butadiene from n-butane by dehydrogenating in two distinct dehydrogenation zones. See Example II on page 3 and claims 1-7 on page 4.

Watson does not teach where the 1,3-butadiene is present in 60-90%, where the n-butane is present in 40-10%, the hydrocyanation reaction, and where the second dehydrogenation is done oxidatively.

Watson teaches that the dehydrogenation catalyst can be regenerated by oxidation. See page 3. Hence, the person of ordinary skill in the art would deem that the dehydrogenation step may be done in the presence of oxygenous gas, such as air.

Arakawa et al. teach a dehydrogenation process to produce 1,3-butadiene from n-butane where the final product after distillation has 25% n-butane and 75% 1,3-butadiene. See Example 1, columns 10-12.

Fischer et al. teach the hydrocyanation reaction of 1,3-butadiene with a nickel(0) catalyst with phosphorus ligands. See Example 15, column 21.

Therefore, the person of ordinary skill in the art would take the two step process of Watson, use the advice of Watson to perform one dehydrogenation oxidatively in order to continuously recharge the catalyst, maximize the yields and perform the distillation step according to Arakawa et al., and use the final product in a hydrocyanation reaction according to Fischer et al. with a reasonable expectation of success. The motivation to combine the references would be to create an automated, continuous process which is preferred in industry.

#### Conclusion

Claims 1-5 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R. Kosack whose telephone number is (571)272-5575. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on (571)-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joseph R Kosack/ Examiner, Art Unit 1626